

REMARKS

In the final Office Action mailed October 1, 2007¹, the Examiner rejected claims 1-11, 13-22, 24-35, and 37-47 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0112928 to Brown et al. ("*Brown*").

By this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1, 5, 7, 18, 20, 27, 46, and 47, and add new claims 49 and 50. Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-11, 13-22, 24-35, 37-47, 49, and 50 will be pending.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-11, 13-22, 24-35, and 37-47 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Brown*. In order to properly anticipate Applicant's claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102, each and every element of the claim in issue must be found, either expressly described or under principles of inherency, in a single prior art reference. Furthermore, "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in...the claim." See M.P.E.P. § 2131 (8th Ed., Rev. 3, Aug. 2005), quoting *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1126, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Finally, "[t]he elements must be arranged as required by the claim." M.P.E.P. § 2131.

Claim 1 recites a method for logging calls comprising "inserting [a] dialed number from [a] call log into a contact list." *Brown* does not teach or suggest "inserting [a] dialed number from [a] call log into a contact list."

¹ As Applicants' remarks with respect to the Examiner's rejections are sufficient to overcome these rejections, Applicants' silence as to certain requirements applicable to such rejections (e.g., whether a reference constitutes prior art, motivation to combine references) is not a concession by Applicants that such requirements have been met, and Applicants reserve the right to analyze and dispute such in the future.

Brown discloses a method, system, and program for logging calls according to a call context (*Brown*, abstract). *Brown* also discloses logging line numbers and the identities of subscribers to the line numbers (*Brown*, ¶ 44). However, *Brown* does not disclose inserting the line numbers into a contact list. Therefore, *Brown* fails to teach or suggest the claimed “inserting [a] dialed number from [a] call log into a contact list,” as recited by independent claim 1.

Because *Brown* fails to teach or suggest each of the features of claim 1, Applicant submits that *Brown* does not anticipate claim 1. Since independent claims 18, 27, 46, and 47 recite language similar to that which distinguishes claim 1 from *Brown*, Applicant further submits that claims 18, 27, 46, and 47 are not anticipated by *Brown* for at least the reasons given with respect to claim 1.

Claims 2-11 and 13-17 depend from claim 1, claims 19-22 and 24-26 depend from claim 18, and claims 28-35 and 37-45 depend from claim 27. Dependent claims 2-11, 13-17, 19-22, 24-26, 28-35, and 37-45 are allowable not only for the reasons stated above with regard to their respective allowable base claims, but also for their own additional features that distinguish them from *Brown*.

Dependent claim 7 recites “wherein retrieving contact-related information includes retrieving a photograph” (emphasis added). *Brown* discloses recording the subject matter of calls, parties involved in a call, billed transactions during a call, and orders placed during a call (*Brown*, ¶ 44). However, *Brown* does not disclose retrieving a photograph. Therefore, *Brown* fails to teach or suggest “wherein retrieving contact-related information includes retrieving a photograph” (emphasis added) as recited by dependent claim 7.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

If there is any fee due in connection with the filing of this Reply, please charge the fee to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 29, 2007

By: Anthony Zili - Reg. No. 53,232
for Jeffrey A. Berkowitz
Reg. No. 36,743